

# EXHIBIT G

# An Analytical Method For Multi-class Molecular Cancer Classification

Ryan Rifkin <sup>\*#&</sup>, Sayan Mukherjee <sup>\*#&</sup>, Pablo Tamayo <sup>\*&</sup>, Sridhar Ramaswamy <sup>\*†</sup>, Chen-Hsiang Yeang <sup>\*††</sup>, Michael Angelo <sup>||</sup>, Michael Reich <sup>\*</sup>, Tomaso Poggio <sup>#</sup>, Eric S. Lander <sup>\*\*</sup>, Todd R. Golub <sup>\*‡</sup> and Jill P. Mesirov <sup>\*&&</sup>.

\* Whitehead Institute / Massachusetts Institute of Technology Center for Genome Research, Cambridge, MA 02139; † Departments of Adult and ‡ Pediatric Oncology, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA 02115; Departments of \*\* Biology, # McGovern Institute, CBCL, Artificial Intelligence Laboratory, and †† Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139. || X-Mine, Brisbane, CA 94005. & These authors contributed equally to this work. && Corresponding author.

June 28, 2002

## Abstract

Modern cancer treatment relies upon clinical judgment and microscopic tissue examination to classify tumors according to anatomical site of origin. This approach is effective but subjective and variable even among experienced clinicians and pathologists. Recently, DNA microarray-generated gene expression data has been used to build molecular cancer classifiers. Previous work from our group and others demonstrated methods for solving pair-wise classification problems using such global gene expression patterns. However, classification across multiple primary tumor classes poses new methodological and computational challenges. In this paper we describe a computational methodology for multi-class prediction that combines class specific (one vs. all) binary Support Vector Machines. We apply this methodology to the diagnosis of multiple common adult malignancies using DNA microarray data from a collection of 198 tumor samples, spanning 14 of the most common tumor types. Overall classification accuracy is 78%, far exceeding the expected accuracy for random classification. In a large subset of the samples (80%), the algorithm attains 90% accuracy. The methodology described in this paper both demonstrates that accurate gene expression-based multi-class cancer diagnosis is possible and highlights some of the analytic challenges inherent in applying to such strategies to biomedical research.

## Introduction

The accurate classification of human cancer is an important component of modern cancer treatment. It is estimated that there are upwards of 40,000 cancer cases per year in the U.S. that are difficult to classify using standard clinical and histopathologic approaches. Molecular approaches to cancer classification have the potential to effectively address these difficulties. However, decades of research in molecular oncology have yielded few useful tumor-specific molecular markers. An important goal in cancer research, therefore, continues to be the identification of tumor specific genes for the purpose of molecular cancer classification.

Proteins in cells are essential to all of the functions of life: energy production, biosynthesis of molecules that form and maintain the complex cellular and sub-cellular structures, response to environmental changes, proliferation etc. Protein production is controlled by the coordinated “expression” of genes by means of “transcription” of DNA sequences into messenger RNA which is in turn “translated” into protein sequences. In this context, the regulation of protein production by induction and repression of genes has been shown to play a

critical role in the major biological decisions of a cell such as division, differentiation and death. In terms of differentiation, an obvious example is that although all of the cells of an individual's body contain essentially the same genome some cells are liver cells while others are heart cells, etc. Gene expression levels have been shown to be critical to making this distinction. A particularly striking example is that of the gene MyoD, a transcription factor that can essentially turn any cell into a muscle cell. Human diseases have also been shown to be correlated with changes in the expression levels of genes. For Mendelian diseases (e.g. cystic fibrosis or Huntington's disease) point mutations along with the absence of gene transcripts of a particular gene may be contributory. Even in the cases of more complex biological states including heart disease, arthritis, aging, and addiction, systematic changes in gene expression associated with these processes have been detected and reported. Based on this knowledge, there has been a significant effort to develop methods for measuring and analyzing the level of gene expression for many genes simultaneously in biological samples. The rationale for such an approach is that the level of gene expression is critical for determining the biological properties of cells (Chipping Forecast 1999).

Several technologies for the high-throughput analysis of gene expression have been developed over the past 10 years. The field is now rapidly developing as several technologies attain maturity and widespread use. The two most common platforms are spotted cDNA<sup>1</sup>, and oligonucleotide microarrays. The cDNA microarrays, pioneered by Brown and colleagues at Stanford (Duggan et al's article in the Chipping Forecast 1999), involves the hybridization of fluorescently labeled cDNA derived from sample RNAs to glass slides onto which DNA strands corresponding to genes of interest have been robotically deposited. The second oligonucleotide arrays, developed at Affymetrix, Inc., involves the hybridization of fluorescently labeled RNAs to short 25-long oligonucleotides of known sequence that are photolithographically synthesized on a solid surface using technology similar to the one used to make silicon chips (Lipshutz et al's article in the Chipping Forecast 1999). Alternative oligonucleotide array strategies employing longer oligos (60-70 mers) generated by ink-jet printing and other technologies appear similarly effective. While few head-to-head comparisons of these methods have been made, the technologies are sensitive, quantitative, and reproducible.

These microarrays allow us for the first time to obtain a "global" genomic view of the cell and measure the simultaneous expression of tens of thousands of genes in a biological or clinical sample and have made possible the creation of large data sets of molecular information that represent molecular "snapshots" of biological systems of interest (see for example E. Dougherty's article in SIAM News May 2002) These gene expression profiles can then be characterized by the application of large-scale data analysis and may serve as fingerprints for accurate molecular classification as well as improve our understanding of normal

---

<sup>1</sup> cDNA is complementary DNA; synthesized from a mRNA template.


and disease states (Golub et al 1999, Slonim et al 2000, Furey et al 2000, Ben-Dor et al 2000, Califano et al 1999).

Previously, the Cancer Genomics program at the center developed computational approaches (unsupervised and supervised learning) using gene expression to accurately distinguish between two common blood cancer classes: acute lymphocytic and acute myelogenous leukemia (Golub et al 1999, Slonim et al 2000, Mukherjee et al 1999). The classification of primary solid tumors (e.g. breast cancer), in contrast, is a harder problem due to limitations concerning sample availability, identification, acquisition, integrity, and preparation. Moreover, a solid tumor is a heterogeneous cellular mix and gene expression profiles might reflect contributions from non-malignant components confounding classification. In addition, there are some intrinsic complexities in making multi-class, as opposed to binary class, distinctions.

In this context we asked whether it is possible to achieve a general, multi-class molecular-based cancer classification based solely on gene expression profiles (Ramaswamy et al 2001-2). This paper describes the details of this approach. The most accurate computational methodology is described in detail and technical limitations and challenges involved are stated. Our methodology is based on combining multiple binary Support Vector Machine classifiers trained to predict a sample's class membership. We apply this methodology to the diagnosis of multiple common adult malignancies using a collection of 198 DNA microarray tumor samples, spanning 14 common tumor types. In the next section we describe the sample collection and the associated experimental protocol. Then we describe the problems associated with multi-class prediction and introduce our methodology and results. A technical description of the Support Vector Machine algorithm is included in the appendix. The methodology described in this paper suggests that systematic and unified cancer diagnosis is possible by the comparison of an unknown sample to a large reference database and provides a first look at the technical difficulties and computational challenges associated with such a system.

### **Sample Collection and Experimental Protocol**

The gene expression datasets were obtained following a standard experimental protocol published elsewhere (Ramaswamy 2001, Golub et al 1999) and described schematically in Figure 1. Tumors were biopsies from primary sites obtained prior to any treatment. RNA from each tumor was sequentially hybridized to Affymetrix Hu6800 and Hu35KsubA oligonucleotide microarrays (GeneChips™) containing a total of 16,063 probe sets. Microarrays were scanned using standard Affymetrix protocols and scanners. Expression values for each gene were calculated using Affymetrix GeneChip software.



**Figure 1. Experimental protocol and dataset creation.**

Tumor data (198 samples) was organized into a training set with 144 samples and a test set with 54 samples. For more details on the experimental system and specimen characteristics see Ramaswamy et al 2001-2. The datasets are available on our web site ([www.genome.wi.mit.edu/MPR/GCM](http://www.genome.wi.mit.edu/MPR/GCM)).

**Table 1. Number of tumor samples per class.**

Tumor Class	# Train	# Test	Tumor Class	# Train	# Test
Breast (BR)	8	3	Uterus (UT)	8	2
Prostate (PR)	8	2	Leukemia (LE)	24	6
Lung (LU)	8	3	Renal (RE)	8	3
Colorectal (CO)	8	5	Pancreas (PA)	8	3
Lymphoma (LY)	16	6	Ovary (OV)	8	3
Bladder (BL)	8	3	Mesothelioma (ML)	8	3
Melanoma (ME)	8	2	Brain (CNS)	16	4

Supervised learning involves “training” a classifier to recognize the distinctions among classes and testing the accuracy of the classifier on an independent test set. Multi-class classification in this context is especially challenging for several reasons including: i) the large dimensionality of the datasets, ii) the small but significant uncertainty in the original labeling, iii) the noise in the experimental and measurement processes, iv) the intrinsic biological variation from specimen to specimen, and v) the small number of examples.


As part of a preliminary feasibility study we explored a variety of prediction methodologies and algorithms and applied them to multiple tumor datasets. The results of this investigation were reported in Yeang et al 2001. Here we will describe in detail the technique that gave us the most accurate results.

### **Multi-Class Supervised Classification**

Multiple class prediction is intrinsically harder than binary prediction because the classification algorithm has to learn to construct a greater number of separation boundaries or relations. In binary classification an algorithm can “carve out” the appropriate decision boundary for only one of the classes, the other class is simply the complement. In multi-class classification each class has to be

explicitly defined. Errors can occur in the construction of any one of the many decision boundaries so the error rates on multi-class problems can be significantly greater than that of binary problems. For example, in contrast to a balanced binary problem where the accuracy of a random prediction is 50%, for  $K$  classes the accuracy of a random predictor is of the order of  $1/K$ . There are basically two types of multi-class classification algorithms. The first type deals directly with multiple values in the target field. For example Naïve Bayes,  $k$ -Nearest Neighbors, and classification trees are in this class. Intuitively, these methods can be interpreted as trying to construct a conditional density for each class, then classifying by selecting the class with maximum a posteriori probability. The second type decomposes the multi-class problem into a set of binary problems and then combines them to make a final multi-class prediction. This class contains support vector machines, boosting (Schapire 1999), and weighted voting algorithms, and, more generally, any binary classifier. Boosting in fact can be used to combine intrinsic multi-class classifiers too (Schapire et al 1998). In certain settings the latter approach results in better performance than the multiple target approaches. Intuitively, when we have a high dimensional input space and very few samples per class, we expect that it will be very difficult to construct accurate densities, and that the second approach will perform better. Our dataset belongs to this category.

The basic idea behind combining binary classifiers is to decompose the multi-class problem into a set of easier and more accessible binary problems. The main advantage in this divide-and-conquer strategy is that any binary classification algorithm can be used. Besides choosing a decomposition scheme and a base classifier, one also needs to devise a strategy for combining the binary classifiers and providing a final prediction. The problem of combining binary classifiers has been studied in the computer science literature (Hastie and Tibshirani 1998, Allwein et al 2000, Guruswami and Sahai 1999) from a theoretical and empirical perspective. However, the literature is inconclusive, and the best method for combining binary classifiers for any particular problem is open.



**Figure 2. One-vs-All classification.** a) Four binary classifiers are trained, the first discriminates the red versus other classes, the second green from the other classes, the third green, and the fourth blue. b) The codebook for OVA classification, the top row lists each OVA classifier, the numbers in the matrix are the ideal outputs for the class labels listed in the leftmost column. c) The colored numbers are five new samples to be classified with the color designating class membership. d) The outputs of the four classifiers and the final class labels for the five new samples.

The decomposition problem in itself is quite old and can be considered as an example of the collective vote-ranking problem addressed by Condorcet and others at the time of the French Revolution. Condorcet was interested in solving the problem of how to deduce a collective ranking of candidates based on individual voters' preferences. He proposed a decomposition scheme based on binary questions (Michaud 1987) and then introduced analytical rules to obtain a consistent collective ranking based on the individual's answers to these binary questions. It turns out that a consistent collective ranking is not guaranteed in all cases and this led to the situation known as Condorcet or Arrow's paradox (Arrow 1951).

Standard modern approaches to combining binary classifiers can be stated in terms of what is called "output coding" (Dietterich and Bakiri 1991). The basic idea behind output coding is the following: given  $K$  classifiers trained on various partitions of the classes a new example is mapped into an output vector. Each element in the output vector is the output from one of the  $K$  classifiers, and a "codebook" is then used to map from this vector to the class label (see Figure 2). For example, given three classes the first classifier may be trained to partition classes one and two from three, the second classifier trained to partition classes two and three from one, and the third classifier trained to partition classes one and two from three.



Two common examples of output coding are the one-versus-all (OVA) and all-pairs (AP) approaches. In the OVA approach, given  $K$  classes,  $K$  independent classifiers are constructed where the  $i^{\text{th}}$  classifier is trained to separate samples belonging to class  $i$  from all others. The codebook is a diagonal matrix and the final prediction is based on the classifier that produces the strongest confidence,

$$\text{class} = \arg \max_{i=1..K} f_i,$$

where  $f_i$  is the signed confidence measure of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  classifier (i.e. the margin of the SVM). In the all-pairs approach  $K(K-1)/2$  classifiers are constructed with each classifier trained to discriminate between a class pair ( $i$  and  $j$ ). This can be thought of as a  $K$  by  $K$  matrix, where the  $ij^{\text{th}}$  entry corresponds to a classifier that discriminates between classes  $i$  and  $j$ . The codebook, in this case, is used to simply sum the entries of each row and select the row for which this sum is maximal,

$$\text{class} = \arg \max_{i=1..K} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^K f_{ij} \right],$$

where as before  $f_{ij}$  is the signed confidence measure for the  $ij^{\text{th}}$  classifier.

An ideal code matrix should be able to correct the mistakes made by the component binary classifiers. Dietterich and Bakiri used error-correcting codes to build the output code matrix where the final prediction is made by assigning a sample to the codeword with the smallest Hamming distance with respect to the binary prediction result vector (Dietterich and Bakiri 1991). There are several other ways of constructing error-correcting codes including classifiers that learn arbitrary class splits and randomly generated matrices (Bode and Ray-Chaudhuri 1960, Allwein et al 2000, Guruswami and Sahai 1999).

Intuitively, there is a tradeoff between the OVA and AP approaches. The discrimination surfaces that need to be learned in the all-pairs approach are, in general, more natural and, theoretically, should be more accurate. However, with fewer training examples the empirical surface constructed may be less precise. The actual performance of each of these schemes, or others such as random codebooks, in combination with different classification algorithms is problem dependent.

**Table 2. Accuracy of different combinations of multi-class approaches and algorithms.**

Number of Genes per Classifier	Weighted Voting	Weighted Voting	k-nearest neighbors	k-nearest neighbors	SVM	SVM
	One vs. All	All Pairs	One vs. All	All Pairs	One vs. All	All Pairs
30	60.0%	62.3%	65.3%	67.2%	70.8%	64.2%
92	59.3%	59.6%	68.0%	67.3%	72.2%	64.8%
281	57.8%	57.2%	65.7%	67.0%	73.4%	65.1%



1073	53.5%	52.4%	66.5%	64.8%	74.1%	64.9%
3276	43.4%	48.8%	66.3%	62.0%	74.7%	64.7%
6400	38.5%	45.6%	64.2%	58.4%	75.5%	64.6%
All	-	-	-	-	78.0%	64.7%

In a preliminary empirical study of multi-class methods and algorithms (Yeang et al 2001) we applied the OVA and AP approaches with three different algorithms: Weighted Voting (Golub et al 1999, Slonim et al 2000), k-Nearest Neighbors and Support Vector Machines (SVM). The results, shown in Table 2, demonstrate that the OVA approach in combination with SVM gave us the most accurate method by a significant margin, and we describe this method in detail below. See Yeang et al 2001 for more details on using other algorithms.

## Support Vector Machines

Support Vector Machines (SVMs) are powerful classification systems based on a variation of regularization techniques (Vapnik 1998, Evgeniou et al 2000). SVMs provide state-of-the-art performance in many practical binary classification problems (Vapnik 1998, Evgeniou et al 2000). SVMs have also shown promise in a variety of biological classification tasks including some involving gene expression microarrays (Mukherjee et al 1999, Brown et al. 2000). For a detailed description of the algorithm see the appendix.

The algorithm is a particular instantiation of regularization for binary classification. Linear SVMs can be viewed as a regularized version of a much older machine-learning algorithm, the perceptron (Rosenblatt 1962, Minsky and Papert 1972). The goal of a perceptron is to find a *separating hyperplane* that separates positive from negative examples. In general, there may be many separating hyperplanes. In our problem, this separating hyperplane is the boundary that separates a given tumor class from the rest (OVA) or two different tumor classes (AP). The SVM solution corresponds to choosing a separating hyperplane that has maximal *margin* that is a maximal distance of the hyperplane to the nearest point. Finding the SVM solution requires training a SVM which entails solving a convex quadratic program with as many variables as training points.

The SVM experiments described in this paper were performed using a modified version of the SvmFu package (<http://www.ai.mit.edu/projects/cbcl/>). The advantages of SVM, when compared with other algorithms, are their sound theoretical foundations (Vapnik 1998, Evgeniou et al 2000), intrinsic control of machine capacity that combats over-fitting, capability to approximate complex classification functions, fast convergence, and good empirical performance in general. Standard SVMs assume the target values are binary and that the classification problem is intrinsically binary. We use the OVA methodology to combine binary SVM classifiers into a multi-class classifier. A separate SVM is trained for each class and the winning class is the one for with the largest margin, which can be thought of as a signed confidence measure.

In the experiments described in this paper there were few data points in many dimensions. Therefore, we used a kernel that corresponds to a linear (regularized) classifier as the SVM solution. Although we did allow the hyperplane to make misclassifications, in all cases involving the full 16,063 dimensions each OVA hyperplane fully separated the training data with no errors. In some of the experiments, which involved explicit feature selection with very few features, there were some training errors. This may indicate that we could select a very small number of features, and then use a kernel function to improve classification; however, preliminary experiments with this approach yielded no improvement over the linear case.

Many methods exist for performing feature selection. We obtained similar results from informal experiments using signal to noise ratio (Slonim et al 2000), recursive feature elimination (RFE) (Guyon et al 2002), and radius-margin-ratio (Mukherjee et al 1999, Weston et al 2001). For the formal presentation we used RFE since it was the most straightforward to implement with the SVM. An SVM is trained using all features. The features are ranked according to the magnitude of the elements of the resulting hyperplane: so the importance of feature  $i$  is  $|w_i|$ .


## Methodology and Results

As was mentioned before the most accurate methodology for our multi-tumor dataset is a combination of an OVA approach and SVMs using all genes. Due to implementation issues RFE was used for feature selection. See the appendix for more details both about SVMs and RFE. Leave-one-out cross validation and an independent test were used to test the methodology.

The procedure is as follows:

- i) Define each target class based on histopathologic clinical evaluation (pathology review) of tumor specimens;
- ii) Decompose the multi-class problem into a series of 14 binary OVA classification problems: one for each class.
- iii) For each class build the binary classifiers on the training set using leave-one-out cross-validation i.e. remove one sample, train the binary classifier on the remaining samples, combine the individual binary classifiers to predict the class of the left out sample, and iteratively repeat this process for all the samples. A cumulative error rate is calculated.
- iv) Evaluate the final prediction model on an independent test set.

This procedure is described pictorially in Figure 3 where the bar graphs on the lower right side show two examples of actual SVM output predictions of each of the 14 SVMs for a Lymphoma and Breast sample.



**Figure 3. Multi-class methodology using a One vs. All (OVA) approach. The bars graphs on the lower right side show the results of a high and a low confidence prediction.**

The final prediction (winning class) of the OVA set of classifiers is the one corresponding to the largest confidence (margin),

$$class = \arg \max_{i=1..K} f_i,$$

The confidence of the final call is the margin of the winning SVM. When the largest confidence is positive the final prediction is considered a “high confidence” call. If negative it is a “low confidence” call that can also be considered a candidate for a no-call because no single SVM “claims” the sample as belonging to its recognizable class. We analyze the error rates in terms of totals and also in terms of high and low confidence calls. In the first example in the lower right hand side of Figure 3, an example of a high confidence call, the Lymphoma classifier attains a large positive margin and recognizes the samples

in this class. No other classifier produces a comparable positive prediction. The second example is a low confidence call where the winning classifier is the one corresponding to the Breast class. In this case the sample is classified as Breast but the confidence of the prediction is much lower than in the first example. Repeating this procedure we created a multi-class OVA-SVM model with all genes using the training dataset and then applied it to the two test datasets. The results are summarized in Table 3.

**Table 3. Accuracy results for the OVA-SVM classifier.**


Dataset	Sample Type	Validation Method	Sample Number	Total Accuracy	Confidence			
					High Fraction	Accuracy	Low Fraction	Accuracy
Train	Multiple Tumors	Cross-val.	144	78%	80%	90%	20%	28%
Test	Multiple Tumors	Train/Test	54	78%	78%	83%	22%	58%

As can be seen in the table in cross validation the overall multi-class predictions were correct for 78% of the tumors. This accuracy is substantially higher than expected for random prediction (9% according to proportional chance criterion). More interestingly the majority of calls (80%) were high confidence, and for these the classifier achieved an accuracy of 90%. The remaining tumors (20%) had low confidence calls and lower accuracy (28%). The results for the test set (test set 1) were similar to the ones obtained in cross-validation: the overall prediction accuracy was 78% and the majority of these predictions (78%) were again high confidence with an accuracy of 83%. Low confidence calls were made on the remaining 22% of tumors with an accuracy of 58%. The actual confidences for each call, and a bar graph of accuracy and fraction of calls versus confidence, is shown in Figure 4-A-B. The confusion matrices are shown in Table 4.

**Table 4. Confusion matrices for the OVA-SVM classifier.**


Train	BL	BR	CNS	CO	LE	LU	LY	ME	ML	OV	PA	PR	RE	UT	Totals	Test1	BL	BR	CNS	CO	LE	LU	LY	ME	ML	OV	PA	PR	RE	UT	Totals	
BL	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	BL	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
BR	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	BR	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
CNS	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	CNS	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
CO	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	CO	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
LE	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	LE	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	6
LU	1	1	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	LU	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
LY	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	LY	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
ME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	ME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
ML	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	1	1	0	0	8	ML	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
OV	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	2	8	OV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4
PA	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	8	PA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
PR	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	0	0	8	PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	6	
RE	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	5	0	8	RE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
UT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	UT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	
Totals	8	11	16	10	24	5	16	10	8	8	6	7	6	9	144	Totals	4	3	4	4	5	2	6	3	4	4	4	5	3	3	5	54

An interesting observation concerning these results is that for 50% of the tumors that were incorrectly classified the correct answer corresponded to the second or third most confident (SVM) prediction. This is shown in Figure 4-C.



**Figure 4. Individual sample errors and confidence calls (A), accuracy bar graphs (B) and performance considering second and third most confident prediction (C) for the train/cross-validation and test datasets.**

To confirm the stability and reproducibility of the prediction results for this collection of samples we repeated the train and test procedure for 100 random splits of a combined dataset. The results were similar to the reported case. Figure 5 shows the mean and standard variation of the error rate for the different test-train splits as a function of the total number of genes. Due to the fact the different test-train splits were obtained by reshuffling the dataset the empirical variance measured is optimistic (Efron and Tibshirani, 1993).



**Figure 5. Mean classification accuracy and standard deviation plotted as a function of number of genes used by the classifier. The prediction accuracy decreases with decreasing number of genes.**

We also analyzed the accuracy of the multi-class SVM predictor as a function of the number of genes. The algorithm inputs all of the 16,063 genes in the array and each of them is assigned a weight based on its relative contribution to each OVA classification. Practically all genes were assigned weakly positive and negative weights in each OVA classifier. We performed multiple runs with different numbers of genes selected using RFE. Results are shown in Figure 5, where total accuracy decreases as the number of input genes decreases for each OVA distinction. Pair-wise distinctions can easily be made between some tumor classes using fewer genes but multi-class distinctions among highly related tumor types are intrinsically more difficult. This behavior can also be the result of the existence of molecularly distinct but unknown sub-classes within known classes that effectively decrease the predictive power of the multi-class method. Despite the increasing accuracy with increased number of genes trend, significant but modest prediction accuracy can be achieved with a relatively small number of genes per classifier (e.g. about 70% with about 200 total genes).

## Conclusions

The method described in this paper demonstrates that the simultaneous diagnosis of multiple tumor types is possible by the comparison of an unknown sample to a reference database of multiple tumor types. The combination of the OVA approach and SVM provides a powerful technique for molecular classification of cancer that appears to outperform other approaches. It is remarkable that a majority of the samples (80%) can be predicted with high confidence and accuracy (83%) solely based on gene expression and despite the presence of varying unknown proportions of non-neoplastic elements in the tumor specimens and the amount of noise, biological variation and uncertainty in the labeling. Despite the success of the method some questions remain open.

What is the exact reason for the remaining errors made by the classification model? The mostly even distribution of errors throughout the solid tumor classes (see Table 4) suggests that total accuracy might increase by considering larger number of samples in the training set. Another source of error might be associated with the inclusion of histopathologically similar, but genetically distinct, tumors in various training set classes. In addition, the fact that 50% of the incorrectly classified tumors belong to the class with the second or third most confident prediction suggests that these errors may be able to be corrected by an incremental improvement (e.g. by acquiring some extra data points for some classes or perhaps by an incremental improvement of the algorithm).

The OVA SVM based classification strategy may not be the optimal method when a larger sample collection becomes available. As discussed above, there is a tradeoff between the OVA and AP approach. One can speculate that with a larger number of samples for a fixed class number there will be a cross over point beyond which the AP SVM method will be the best. A larger number of tumors with detailed clinical annotation will be required to answer all these questions and fully explore the limitations of our approach.

One can envision a centralized gene expression database that will allow classification accuracy to improve as the model is trained by larger and larger amounts of data. In this scenario the clinical classification and diagnosis of tumors can be improved by considering objective, systematic, and standardized computational methods like the one described here. This expression-based cancer classification will not be a substitute for traditional diagnostics, but it may represent an important adjunct. The hope is that the molecular characteristics of a tumor sample may for the most part remain the same despite atypical clinical or varying histological features. If this is indeed the case, then the deployment of these computational methods will enable powerful new strategies for a more uniform and comprehensive molecular classification of primary and metastatic tumors.

## Appendix: Support Vector Machines

The problem of learning a classification boundary given positive and negative examples is a particular case of the problem of approximating a multivariate function from sparse data. The problem of approximating a function from sparse data is ill-posed and regularization theory is a classical approach to solving it (Tikhonov and Arsenin 1977).

Standard regularization theory formulates the approximation problem as a variational problem of finding the function  $f$  that minimizes the following functional

$$\min_{f \in H} I(f) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^{\lambda} V(y_i, f(x_i)) + \lambda \|f\|_K^2$$

where  $V(\cdot, \cdot)$  is a loss function,  $\|f\|_K^2$  is a norm in a Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space defined by the positive definite function  $K(x, t)$  (Aronszajn 1950),  $\lambda$  is the number of training examples, and  $\lambda$  is the regularization parameter. Under rather general conditions the solution to the above functional has the form

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\lambda} \alpha_i K(x, x_i).$$

SVMs are a particular case of the above regularization framework (Evgeniou et al 2000).

Here we describe in more detail how the SVM algorithm works. The SVM runs described in this paper were performed using a modified version of SvmFu (<http://www.ai.mit.edu/projects/cbcl/>). We also describe the feature selection method used to study how the accuracy changes as a function of the number of genes. For a more comprehensive introduction to SVM see Evgeniou et al., 2000 and Vapnik, 1998.

For the SVM the regularization functional minimized is the following

$$\min_{f \in H} \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^{\lambda} (1 - y_i f(x_i))_+ + \lambda \|f\|_K^2,$$



where the hinge loss function  $(a)_+$ , the  $\min(a, 0)$ , is used. The solution again has the form  $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\lambda} \alpha_i K(x, x_i)$  and the label output is simply  $\text{sign}(f(x))$ .

There is an intuitive geometric interpretation of the SVM approach in the case of a linear classifier, which corresponds to  $K(x, x_i) = x \cdot x_i$ . A hyperplane is defined via its normal vector  $w$ . Given a hyperplane  $w$  and a point  $x$ , define  $x_0$  to be the closest point to  $x$  on the hyperplane -- the closest point to  $x$  that satisfies  $w \cdot x_0 = 0$  (see Figure 6). We then have the following two equations:

$$w \cdot x = k \quad \text{for some } k$$

$$w \cdot x_0 = 0.$$

Subtracting these two equations, we obtain,

$$w \cdot (x - x_0) = k.$$

Dividing by the norm of  $w$ , we have,

$$\frac{w}{\|w\|} \cdot (x - x_0) = \frac{k}{\|w\|}$$

Noting that  $\frac{w}{\|w\|}$  is a unit vector, and the vector  $x - x_0$  is parallel to  $w$ , we conclude that,

$$\|x - x_0\| = \frac{|k|}{\|w\|}.$$




Figure 6. The distance between points  $x$  and  $x_0$ .

Our goal is to maximize the distance between the hyperplane and the closest point, with the constraint that the points from the two classes lie on separate sides of the hyperplane. We could try to solve the following optimization problem:

$$\max_{\mathbf{w}} \min_{x_i} \frac{y_i(\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x}_i)}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \text{ subject to } y_i(\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x}_i) > 0 \text{ for all } x_i.$$

Note that  $y_i(\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x}_i) = |k|$  in the above derivation. For technical reasons, the optimization problem stated above is not easy to solve. One difficulty is that if we find a solution  $\mathbf{w}$ , then  $c\mathbf{w}$  for any positive constant  $c$  is also a solution. In some sense, we are interested in the *direction* of the vector  $\mathbf{w}$ , but not its length.

If we can find any solution  $\mathbf{w}$  to the above problem, for example by scaling  $\mathbf{w}$ , we can guarantee that  $y_i(\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x}_i) \geq 1$  for all  $x_i$ . Therefore, we may equivalently solve the problem,

$$\max_{\mathbf{w}} \min_{x_i} \frac{y_i(\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x}_i)}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \text{ subject to } y_i(\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x}_i) \geq 1.$$

Note that the original problem has more solutions than this one, but since we are only interested in the direction of the optimal hyperplane, this would suffice. We now restrict the problem further: we are going to find a solution such that for any point *closest* to the hyperplane, the inequality constraint will be satisfied as an *equality*. Keeping this in mind, we can see that,

$$\min_{x_i} \frac{y_i(\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x}_i)}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} = 1.$$

So the problem becomes,

$$\max \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{w}\|} \text{ subject to } y_i(\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x}_i) \geq 1.$$

which can be transformed (see Vapnik, 1998) into the equivalent problem

$$\min \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 \text{ subject to } y_i(\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x}_i) \geq 1.$$

Note that so far, we have considered only hyperplanes that pass through the origin. In many applications, this restriction is unnecessary, and the standard separable SVM problem is written as,

$$\min \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 \text{ subject to } y_i(\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{b}) \geq 1,$$

where  $b$  is a free *threshold* parameter that translates the optimal hyperplane relative to the origin.

In practice, datasets are often not linearly separable. To deal with this situation, we add *slack variables* that allow us to violate our original distance constraints. The problem becomes:

$$\min \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 + C \sum_i \chi_i \text{ subject to } y_i(\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x}_i + b) \geq 1 - \chi_i, \chi_i \geq 0 \text{ for all } i.$$

This new program trades off the two goals of finding a hyperplane with large margin (minimizing  $\|\mathbf{w}\|$ ), and finding a hyperplane that separates the data well (minimizing the  $\chi_i$ ). The parameter  $C$  controls this tradeoff. It is no longer simple to interpret the final solution of the SVM problem geometrically; the latter formulation, which correspond to the original regularization problem of minimizing  $I(f)$ , works very well in practice. Even if the data at hand *can* be separated completely, it may be preferable to use a hyperplane that makes some errors, if this results in a much smaller  $\|\mathbf{w}\|$ .

In general SVMs can find a *nonlinear* separating surface. This follows from the use of a general positive definite kernel. Again, there is an obvious geometric interpretation of this classic function approximation technique. The basic idea is to think of the kernel as a way to nonlinearly map the data to a *feature space* of high or possibly infinite dimension,

$$\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \phi(\mathbf{x}).$$

A linear separating hyperplane in the feature space corresponds to a nonlinear surface in the original space. We can write the program as follows,

$$\min \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 + C \sum_i \chi_i \text{ subject to } y_i(\mathbf{w} \cdot \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) + b) \geq 1 - \chi_i, \chi_i \geq 0 \text{ for all } i.$$

Note that as phrased above,  $\mathbf{w}$  is a hyperplane in the feature space. In practice, we solve the Wolfe dual of the optimization problems presented and avoid having to work with  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ , the hyperplane and the feature vectors, explicitly. In fact, it is well know from the classical theory of integral operators that every positive definite symmetric function of two variables can be represented – under mild conditions -- as a dot product of the eigenvectors of the integral operator associated with it. Thus

$$K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) \cdot \phi(\mathbf{x}_j).$$

For example, if we use as our kernel function a Gaussian kernel,

$$K(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j) = \exp(-\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|^2).$$

This corresponds to mapping our original vectors  $\mathbf{x}_i$  to a certain countably infinite dimensional feature space when  $\mathbf{x}$  is in a bounded domain and an uncountably infinite dimensional feature space when the domain is not bounded.

Many methods exist for performing feature selection (Slonim et al 2000, Weston et al 2001, Guyon et al 2002, Mukherjee et al 1999). In informal experiments, all resulted in similar performance. For the feature selection experiments described in this paper, we used recursive feature elimination (RFE) (Guyon et al 2002). The method recursively removes features based upon the absolute magnitude of the hyperplane elements. Given microarray data with  $n$  genes per sample, the SVM outputs a hyperplane,  $\mathbf{w}$ , which can be thought of as a vector with  $n$  components each corresponding to the expression of a particular gene. Loosely speaking, assuming that the expression values of each gene have similar ranges, the absolute magnitude of each element in  $\mathbf{w}$  determines its importance in classifying a sample, since,

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{x}_i + b,$$

and the class label is  $\text{sign}[f(\mathbf{x})]$ . The SVM is trained with all genes, the expression values of genes corresponding to  $|\mathbf{w}_i|$  in the bottom 10% are removed and the SVM is retrained with the smaller gene expression set.

## Acknowledgements

We thank Raphael Bueno, Kevin Loughlin, Scott Pomeroy, Margaret Shipp, and Phil Febbo for contributing tumor samples to this study. We also thank David Waltregny for initial review of pathology and Christine Huard and Michelle Gaasenbeek for expert technical laboratory assistance. We are indebted to members of the Cancer Genomics Group, Whitehead / MIT Center for Genome Research and the Golub Laboratory, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute for many valuable discussions. This work is supported in part by grants from Affymetrix Inc., Millennium Pharmaceuticals Inc., and Bristol-Myers Squibb Company (ESL), a Harvard / NIH Training Grant in Molecular Hematology (SR), and a grant from the Sloan Foundation.

## References

- Allwein et al 2000.** E. L. Allwein et al Reducing multiclass to binary: a unifying approach for margin classifiers. *Procs. of ICML 2000*.
- Arrow 1951.** K. J. Arrow. Social Choice and Individual Values, Wiley New York and London, 1951.

- Aronszajn 1950.** Aronszajn, N. Theory of Reproducing Kernels, Trans. American Mathematical Society, 686:337-404, 1950.
- Ben-Dor et al 2000.** A. Ben-Dor et al, Tissue Classification with Gene Expression Profiles, J. Computational Biology, 7: 559-584, 2000.
- Bode and Ray-Chaudhuri 1960.** R. C. Bose and D. K. Ray-Chaudhuri. On a class of error-correcting binary group codes. *Information control*, 3:68-79, 1960.
- Brown et al 2000.** Brown, M.P., Grundy, W.N., Lin, D., Christianini, N., Sugnet, C.W., Furey, T.S., Ares, M., & Haussler, D. (2000) *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **97**, 262-267.
- Califano et al 1999.** Califano et al. Analysis of Gene Expression Microarrays for Phenotype Classification. Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Intelligent Systems for Molecular Biology, San Diego, California, August 19-23, p75-85, 1999.
- Chipping Forecast 1999.** Nature Genetics volume 21, Supplement (1999).
- Dietterich and Bakiri 1991.** Error-correcting output codes: a general method for improving multiclass inductive programs. *Procs. of AAAI*, 572-577, 1991.
- Efron and Tibshirani 1993.** Efron, B. and Tibshirani, R. Introduction to the Bootstrap, Chapman and Hall, New York and London, 1983.
- Evgeniou et al 2000.** Evgeniou, T., Pontil, M. and Poggio, T. Regularization networks and support vector machines. *Advances in Computational Mathematics*, 13:1-50, 2000.
- Furey et al 2000.** Furey, T.S., Cristianini, N., Duffy, N., Bednarski, D.W., Schummer, M. and Haussler, D. Support vector machine classification and validation of cancer tissue samples using microarray expression data. *Bioinformatics*, 16, 906—914 (2000).
- Golub et al 1999.** Golub, T.R., Slonim, D.K., Tamayo, P., Huard, C., Gaasenbeek, M., Mesirov, J.P., Coller H., Loh, M.L., Downing, J.R., Caligiuri, M.A., Bloomfield, C.D., & Lander, E.S. (1999) *Science* **286**, 531-537.
- Guruswami and Sahai 1999.** V. Guruswami and A. Sahai. Multiclass learning, boosting and error-correcting codes. In *Procs. of the Twelfth Annual Conference on Computational Learning Theory*, 145-155, ACM Press, 1999.
- Guyon et al 2002.** I. Guyon, J. Weston, S. Barnhill and V. Vapnik. Gene selection for cancer classification using support vector machines. *Machine Learning*, Vol. 46, pp. 389–422 2002. <http://homepages.nyu.edu/~jaw281/genesel.pdf>
- Hastie and Tibshirani 1998.** T. Hastie and R. Tibshirani, Classification by pairwise coupling. In *advances on Neural Processing Systems* 10, MIT Press, 1998.
- Michaud 1987.** P. Michaud. Condorcet – A man of the Avant-Garde. *Applied Stochastic Models and Data Analysis*, Vol. 3, 173-189 (1987).
- Minsky and Papert 1972.** M. Minsky and S. Papert. Perceptrons, An Introduction to Computational Geometry. MIT Press. 1972 (2<sup>nd</sup>. printing).
- Mukherjee et al 1999.** Mukherjee S. et al. Support vector machine classification of microarray data. CBCL Paper #182 Artificial Intelligence Lab. Memo #1676, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, December 1999. <http://www.ai.mit.edu/projects/cbcl/publications/ps/cancer.ps>
- Ramaswamy et al 2001.** Ramaswamy, S., Osteen, R.T., & Shulman, L.N. (2001) in *Clinical Oncology*, eds. Lenhard, R.E., Osteen, R.T., & Gansler, T. (American Cancer Society, Atlanta, GA), pp.711-719.
- Ramaswamy et al 2001-2.** S. Ramaswamy et al. A Uniform Approach To Molecular Cancer Diagnosis Using Tumor Gene Expression Signatures. *PNAS* 98: 15149-15154.
- Rosenblatt 1962.** F. Rosenblatt, Principles of Neurodynamics. Spartan Books, New York, 1962.
- Schapire 1999.** Robert E. Schapire. A brief introduction to boosting. *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 1999.
- Schapire et al 1998.** Robert E. Schapire, Yoav Freund, Peter Bartlett, and Wee Sun Lee. Boosting the margin: a new explanation for the effectiveness of voting methods. *The Annals of Statistics*, 26(5):1651-1686, October, 1998.

**Slonim et al 2000.** Slonim, D.K. (2000) in *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual International Conference on Computational Molecular Biology (RECOMB)* (Universal Academy Press, Tokyo, Japan), pp. 263-272.

**Tikhonov and Arsenin 1977.** Tikhonov, A.N. and Arsenin, V.Y., *Solutions of Ill-posed Problems*, W.H. Winston, Washington D.C., 1977.

**Tomaszewski and LiVolsi 1999.** Tomaszewski, J.E. & LiVolsi, V.A. (1999) *Cancer* **86**, 2198-2200.

**Weston et al 2001.** Weston, J., Mukherjee, M., Chapelle, O., Pontil, M., Poggio, T., Vapnik, V., Feature Selection for SVMs, *Proceedings of Advances in Neural Information Processing* volume 13, 2000.

**Vapnik 1998.** Vapnik, V.N. *Statistical Learning Theory* (John Wiley & Sons, New York), 1998.

**Yeang et al 2001.** C. Yeang et al, Molecular Classification of Multiple Tumor Types, *Bioinformatics Discovery Note*, Vol. 1 no. 1 2001 Pages 1-7, 2001.